

# Real-time Operating Systems and Systems Programming

## Optimization

# Optimizing compilers

- Same code has different representations
- Some are more efficient (yet less readable)
- Handwritten assembler code is often optimal

How to optimize: use -O option for gcc

Why not the default option?

# Limitations

- Never alter the correct program behaviour
- Their understanding of program behaviour is limited
- Compilation must be fast

# Optimization blockers

```
void foo1(int *xp, int *yp)
{
    *xp += *yp;
    *xp += *yp;
}
```

```
void foo2(int *xp, int *yp)
{
    *xp += 2* *yp;
}
```

- Similar code
- First uses 6 memory references, second 3
- Would be possible to optimize?
- What happens if pointers are equal?

# Optimization blockers

```
int f(int);  
int func1(x) {  
    return f(x) + f(x) \  
        + f(x)+ f(x);  
}
```

```
int func2(x) {  
    return 4*f(x)  
}
```

- func2() faster
- but only in case f() is without side effects
- Usually not tested

# Program performance assessment

- Speed of processors can vary
- Useful measure for examples: *cycles per element*.
- What is the code overhead for any array element

# Base example

```
typedef struct {  
    int len;  
    data_t *data;  
} vec_rec, *vec_ptr;
```

```
typedef int data_t; //or float for experiments
```

```
#define IDENT 0 // or 1  
#define OPER + //or *
```

```
// actual implementation of vectors less interesting
```

# Base implementation

```
void combine1(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int i;  
    *dest = IDENT;  
    for (i = 0; i < vec_length(v); i++) {  
        data_t val;  
        get_vec_element(v, i, &val);  
        *dest = *dest OPER val;  
    }  
}
```

//	int	float
// unoptimized	+42 *41	+41 *160
// optimized -O2	+31 *33	+31 *143



# Moving calculations from loop

```
void combine2(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int i;  
    int length = vec_length(v)  
    *dest = IDENT;  
    for (i = 0; i < length; i++) {  
        data_t val;  
        get_vec_element(v, i, &val);  
        *dest = *dest OPER val;  
    }  
}
```

// old optimized -O2	+31 *33	+31 *143
// move vec_len	+22 *21	+21 *135

# Reducing function calls

```
void combine3(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int i;  
    int length = vec_length(v)  
    data_t *data = get_vec_start(v);  
    *dest = IDENT;  
    for (i = 0; i < length; i++) {  
        *dest = *dest OPER data[i];  
    }  
}
```

```
// move vec_len          +22 *21  +21  *135  
// direct data access     +6   *9   +8   *117
```

// Note: we gained speed by losing in abstraction & modularity

# Decompilation analysis

*Compare 3*

*dest in edi, data in ecx, i in edx, length in esi*

<b>.L18</b>	<b>:loop</b>
<b>movl (%edi), %eax</b>	Read dest
<b>imull (%ecx, %edx, 4), %eax</b>	Multiply data
<b>movl %eax, (%edi)</b>	Write *dest
<b>incl %edx</b>	i++
<b>cmpl %esi, %edx</b>	Compare i:length
<b>jl .L18</b>	if < goto loop

*Compare 4*

*data in eax, x in ecx, i in edx, length in esi*

<b>.L24</b>	<b>:loop</b>
<b>imull (%eax, %edx, 4) %ecx</b>	Multiply by data[i]
<b>incl %edx</b>	i++
<b>cmpl %esi, %edx</b>	Compare i:length
<b>jl .L24</b>	If <, goto loop

# Storage variable

```
void combine4(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int i;  
    int length = vec_length(v)  
    data_t *data = get_vec_start(v);  
    data_t x = IDENT;  
    *dest = IDENT;  
    for (i = 0; i < length; i++) {  
        x = x OPER data[i];  
    }  
    *dest = x;  
}  
  
// direct data access      +6   *9   +8   *117  
// temporary variable      +2   *4   +3   *5  
  
// Why not automatic?
```

# Different functions

- `combine3(v, get_vec_start(v) + 2);`
- `combine4(v, get_vec_start(v) + 2);`
- Last element used for destination

c3

2 3 5

2 3 1

2 3 2

2 3 6

2 3 36

2 3 36

c4

2 3 5

2 3 5

2 3 5

2 3 5

2 3 5

2 3 30

# Aside: further optimizations

- Modern processors use pipelining, parallelization
- Can be used for advantage

# Loop unrolling

```
void combine5(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int i;  
    int length = vec_length(v)  
    int limit = length - 2;  
    data_t *data = get_vec_start(v);  
    data_t x = IDENT;  
    *dest = IDENT;  
    for (i = 0; i < limit; i += 3) {  
        x = x OPER data[i] OPER data[i+1] OPER data[i+2];  
    }  
    for(; i < length; i++) {  
        x = x OPER data[i];  
    }  
    *dest = x;  
}
```

```
// temporary variable      +2    *4   +3    *5  
// loop unroll x3          +1.3 *4   +3    *5
```

```
// How many unrollings optimal?
```

# Pointer code

- Use pointer code for speedups

```
void combine4p(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int length = vec_length(v)  
    data_t *data = get_vec_start(v);  
    data_t *dend = data + length;  
    data_t x = IDENT;  
    for (; data < dend; data++) {  
        x = x OPER *data;  
    }  
    *dest = x;  
}
```

// temporary variable	+2	*4	+3	*5
// pointer code	<b>+3</b>	<b>*4</b>	<b>+3</b>	<b>*5</b>

// Mostly useless here, but really depends on compiler/platform  
// Readability often priority



# Parallelism

- It's often good to parallelize code

```
void combine6(vec_ptr v, data_t *dest) {  
    int length = vec_length(v);  
    int limit = length - 1;  
    data_t *data = get_vec_start(v);  
    data_t x0 = IDENT; data_t x1 = IDENT;  
    int i;  
    for(i = 0; i < limit; i+=2) {  
        x0 = x0 OPER data[i];  
        x1 = x1 IOOPER data[i+1];  
    }  
    for(; i < length; i++) {  
        x0 = x0 OPER data[i];  
    }  
    *dest = x0 OPER x1;  
}  
// loop unroll x3  
// parallelize by 2
```

+1.3 *4	+3	*5
+1.5 *2	+2	*2.5

# End results

- For most things unroll x8, parallel x4 is best
- For integer addition, best unroll x16
- **on Pentium III**
- Your results would be different

# Less predictable features

- Cached data
- Load/store latency
- Branch prediction (predictive execution)

# Cache

```
struct a {  
    int a;  
    int b;  
    int c;  
    int d;  
};
```

```
struct a {  
    int a;  
    int b;  
};
```

This is faster!

# Row vs Column based access

- For two-dimensional arrays, visit by rows, not by columns!

# What to do in real-life?

- High level design: choose appropriate algorithms and data structures.
- Basic coding principles
  - Eliminate excessive function calls, move computations out from loops, compromise on modularity
  - Eliminate unnecessary memory references. Use temporary variables to hold intermediate results. Store results only when final value calculated

# Real-Life 2

- Low level optimizations
  - Try different pointer-array code
  - Reduce loop overhead by unrolling them
  - Pipelined architecture: Find ways to split iterations when needed
- Avoid introducing errors by unittesting.  
Benchmark to find anomalies

# GCC Options for Optimization

- -O0 – "don't optimize, keep code for debug"
- -O1 – "optimize, but don't spend time on it"
- -O2 – "optimize, but don't trade speed for size"
  - compilation will take more time
- -O3 – "optimize well"
- -Os – "optimize for (code) size"
- -Ofast – "O3 + break standards"
- -Og – "optimize, but let me debug"



# Profiling

- Gprof
  - calculates cpu time for programs
  - counts function calling
  - thus gives data on what to optimize for greater gain
- Use -pg option for compiling on gcc
  - runs slower due to data collection, gmon.out file
- gprof prog  
to analyze (gives a table of functions, times, etc)

# Code Efficiency

- To avoid macro definitions, C99 has keyword: inline
- When checking for alternatives, use switch carefully:
  - Put more popular cases first
  - Use function pointer arrays
- Inline assembly
- Global variables (but maintenance nightmare)

# Code Efficiency

- Fixed-vs-floating point: former is faster
  - Small amount of decimal places:  $val \ll 2$
- Use native word size (bus + registers are faster)

# Code Size

- Standard library routines refer to other functions. Write your own printf()
- Goto is bad, yet good for jumping out of nested loops.

```
Int fun(void) {  
    /* working */  
    goto CLEANING; /* in case of error */  
    /* more work */  
    return SUCCESS;  
CLEANING:  
    /* cleanup here */  
    return FAILURE;  
}
```

# Memory Usage

- Reduce dependence on stack & heap by using ROM for constant values (declare them as const)
- Some constants change: use flash memory & technicians
- Stack space estimation: fill memory with some pattern; check changes after running

# Power-saving

- Necessary for battery-powered devices
- Processor modes (PXA255 example)
  - Turbo – minimize memory access due to waiting
  - Run – default mode
  - Idle – processor not clocked, peripherals operate
  - Sleep – lowest power state
- Clock frequency – tricky, needs HW knowledge
- Reduce external memory access – cache, processor memory

# Optimization problems

- Dead code elimination
  - Declare variables as volatile
- Debugging more difficult: breakpoints missing, functions split and code different